

**REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed August 16, 2004, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to December 16, 2004. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 29, 2004.

Claims 1-41 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 5, 9, 17, 25 and 33 are independent. Claims 1-41 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention and to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 1-41 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 9-49 of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,005 to Koyama et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is patentably distinct from the claims of the Koyama '005 patent.

As stated in MPEP § 804, under the heading "Obviousness-Type," in order to form an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, a claim in the present application must define an invention that is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the prior art patent, and the claimed subject matter must not be patentably distinct from the subject matter claimed in a commonly owned patent. Also, the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art.


The Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness-type double patenting rejection because independent claims 1, 5, 9, 17, 25 and 33 of the present application are patentably distinct from the claims of Koyama '005. Specifically, the independent claims of the present application have been amended to recite that two P-channel transistors and two N-channel transistors are arranged in a line, which is supported, for example, by at least Figure 5 of the present specification. The Applicants respectfully

submit that the above-referenced arrangement enables the area of the claimed D/A converter to be small. In addition, the Applicants have amended the independent claims in order to clarify the connection of the first transistors and the gradation voltage lines. The claims of Koyama '005 do not teach or suggest at least the above-referenced features of the claims of the present application.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is patentably distinct from the claims of the Koyama '005 patent. Reconsideration of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789